



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GOODWIN'S GREEK GRAMMAR.¹

SOME months ago we received a letter from the Rector of what was formerly the best equipped classical school in the South. He wrote asking us to recommend him a classical teacher, but in a tone of despair added: "I am almost tempted to abolish the classics in my school, so unfortunate have I been in my teachers during the past few years. They do not seem to be able to interest the students. The boys protest against the study, and parents see no use in it." This letter sounds the key-note to the whole situation. The trouble all along has been that we have poor teachers and bad methods and short-sighted parents. "What we want," says Dr. Gildersleeve, "is not less Latin and Greek, but less waste of time in learning, or pretending to learn, Latin and Greek. We want improved methods of teaching, and in order to get better methods we want better teachers. We want teachers who have a living and breathing knowledge of the language which they profess to teach; a knowledge which the learner can bathe in as well as drink."

For ages we have had to contend against the enemies of higher culture and the cry goes out almost daily, "The Philistines be upon you;" but the cause has not lacked champions, although the weapon wielded by Samson of old has been used against us in this struggle. It was well said by Dean Stanley that during all the ages when the oracle of Delphi commanded the reverence of Greece, the place in which it was enshrined needed no walls for its defense. "The majesty of its temple was sufficient. Its fortifications, as useless as they were unseemly, were built only in that disastrous time when the ancient faith had decayed, and the ora-

¹ *A Greek Grammar*, by William W. Goodwin, Hon. LL.D., and D. C. L. Eliot Professor of Greek Literature in Harvard University. Revised and enlarged. Boston: Ginn & Company. 1892.

cle was compelled to rely on the arm of flesh, on its bulwarks of brick and stone, not on its own intrinsic sanctity."

Such was the reverence formerly entertained for classical studies, and although mutterings had been heard from time to time, all comparatively recent and outspoken opposition in this country may be said to date from the year 1883, when Mr. Charles Francis Adams, Jr., delivered his famous address before the Harvard Chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Association on a "College Fetich."

The "College Fetich" of which he spoke on that occasion was the worship of the Greek Language, and with powerful invective he called upon us "to do away with this Idol," to reconstruct our academic and university systems after the inspiration of modern ideas, and to substitute those studies which would be more efficient in their disciplinary value and more useful by reason of their closer affinities with the practical tendencies of our modern scientific life.

There are, however, nowhere signs of a break with the past, and with Dr. Gildersleeve we "still live in the abiding assurance that what is inwrought in the structure of our history and our literature must survive so long as the history of our race and the history of our language shall survive. To disentwine the warp of the classics from the woof of our life is simply impossible."

We have abundant evidence that the cause of the classics in this country is not on the wane. The fact that in the city of Boston alone we have three prosperous publishing houses devoted almost exclusively to the publication of Latin and Greek text-books, would indicate that the demand for such publications is increasing, and the several editions of *Goodwin's Greek Grammar* mark the progress that has been made in the methods of teaching.

This popular grammar, which has reached its third edition, merits all the success that has been vouchsafed to it. The first edition appeared in 1870, and was a little volume of some two hundred and thirty-five pages. The second edition of 1879, contained three hundred and ninety-three

pages, and marked a decided advance over its predecessor. The third edition, of 1892, numbers four hundred and fifty-one pages, being almost double the size of the first edition, and fifty-eight pages larger than the second. It is as much superior to the second edition as the latter was to the first.

In his Preface the author takes occasion to defend this repeated increase in the size of his book, not because, says he, "I attribute ever-increasing importance to the study of formal grammar in school. On the contrary, the growth of the book has come from a more decided opinion that the amount of grammar which should be learned by rote is exceedingly small compared with that which every real student of the classics must learn in a very different way. When it was thought that a pupil must first learn his Latin and Greek grammars, and then learn to read Latin and Greek, it was essential to reduce a school grammar to its least possible dimensions. Now, when a more sensible system leaves most of the details of grammar to be learned by the study of special points which arise in reading or writing, the case is entirely different; and few good teachers or good students are any longer grateful for a small grammar which must soon be discarded as the horizon widens and new questions press for an answer."

No one will take issue with Dr. Goodwin upon the enlargement of his grammar, which the above reasoning so fully justifies. It may be said in advance that almost every addition and alteration is a gain, but it is to be regretted that there have been left undone some things which ought to have been done, and that in other instances the author has failed to profit by the teachings of that scholar "whose writings have thrown light upon most of the dark places in Greek Syntax."

The Introduction remains the same except that here and there are found passages interjected by way of elucidation. Part I., treating of Letters, Syllables, and Accents, is somewhat expanded and greatly improved. Especially valuable is the section on the ancient pronunciation of the Greek, and the table of contractions, on page 15, the omission of which

in former editions is inexplicable. Part II., on Inflection, reveals several changes, chiefly in the sections on the Verb, which are for the most part rewritten and remodelled. Every page is marked by the results of more recent investigations. The quantity of long *α*, *ι*, *υ*, which is indicated in Parts I., II., and III., satisfies a "long-felt want." The paradigms and synopses of the verb are given in a new and more attractive form. The nine tense systems are clearly distinguished in each synopsis and also in the paradigms, so far as is consistent with a proper distinction of the three voices. The verbs in *μ* are now inflected in close connection with those in *ω*. The now established Attic forms of the pluperfect active are given in the paradigms. The "connecting vowel" has been discarded, the familiar term "thematic vowel" has been adopted in place of "variable vowel," which was used in the former editions to designate the *ο* or *ε* added to the verb stem to form the present stem of verbs in *ω*. The whole subject of tense stems and their inflection has been made clearer. All this the author claims in his Preface, and a careful examination fully justifies the claim.

Part III., on the Formation of Words, is little changed except by additions. Thus far our author leaves small ground for criticism. But Part IV., on the Syntax, is confessedly the most important part, and it is here that most fault may be found. The "chief principles of Greek Syntax," says Dr. Goodwin, "have always seemed to me more profitable for a pupil in the earlier years of his classical studies than the details of vowel changes and exceptional forms which are often thought more seasonable." We are told that the changes made in the new edition of the "Greek Moods and Tenses" have been adopted so far as is possible in this grammar, but there as here we fail to observe any important changes for the better that may not be traced directly or indirectly to Dr. Gildersleeve. This, of course, does not affect the usefulness of the book, but it affords an interesting study in determining the question of authorship. It is true that in his preface to the new edition of the "Moods and Tenses," our author

did make a suitable acknowledgement to Dr. Gildersleeve, but in his preface to the volume under review, he seems to regard any recognition of obligation as altogether unnecessary. That such obligation does in very truth exist may be made clear from the following comparisons.

"The treatment of ὥστε," says our author, "is entirely new, and the distinction between the Infinitive with ὥστε μή and the Indicative with ὥστε οὐ is explained." Let us see in what sense the treatment of ὥστε may be regarded as new. In the 1879 edition we find: "ὥστε (sometimes ὥς) *so that*, which generally takes the Infinitive, is sometimes followed by the Indicative to express a *result*. The negative is οὐ." In a subsequent remark it is added: "When ὥστε takes the Infinitive (with negative μή) the action of the verb is stated more distinctly as a *result* depending on the action of the leading verb; the Indicative emphasizes the action rather as an independent fact." What all this means is not very clear. In the new edition we find: "ὥστε (sometimes ὥς) *so as, so that*, is used with the Infinitive and with the Indicative to express a result. With the Infinitive (the negative being μή), the result is stated as one which the action of the leading verb *tends* to produce; with the Indicative (the negative being οὐ) as one which that action actually *does* produce. These two constructions are essentially distinct in their nature, even when it is indifferent to the general sense which is used in a given case."

So far as the old edition is concerned then, the treatment is doubtless new, but when we recall the words of Dr. Gildersleeve, uttered long since, the air of novelty vanishes. Dr. Gildersleeve thus expressed it years ago: "ὥστε or ὥς with the Infinitive (negative μή) expresses the tendency or adaptation to produce a result, 'so as,' which is often conveniently translated 'so that'—the proper rendering of ὥστε (seldom ὥς) with the finite verb (negative οὐ) which expresses the actual result." In his new edition Dr. Goodwin is careful to observe the distinction between the Infinitive and the Indicative constructions by the translations "so as" and "so that" respect-

ively, as recommended by Dr. Gildersleeve, although this distinction was not consistently observed in the old edition.

Again, Dr. Goodwin's prefatory statement that "the use of $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ with the Infinitive and the finite moods is more accurately stated," is verified. What he said in the old edition amounted to this: "When $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ does not take the Infinitive it takes the Indicative, Subjunctive, or Optative." A reference to another paragraph discloses the definite and satisfactory information that "when $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ does not take the Indicative, Subjunctive, or Optative, it takes the Infinitive." But here again Dr. Gildersleeve's utterances are brought into play. Says the latter: "When $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ *must* be translated 'before' it *must* have the Infinitive. When it *may* be translated 'until,' it *may* take the finite constructions of $\xi\omega\varsigma$ 'until.' After *positive* sentences $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ commonly takes the Infinitive. After *negative* sentences it has the construction of $\xi\omega\varsigma$ 'until' when the meaning is that of $\xi\omega\varsigma$. This is the Attic rule, but exceptions occur."

Compare with this Dr. Goodwin: ". . . But in other Greek it has the Infinitive chiefly when it means simply *before*, and when the leading clause is affirmative; it has the finite moods only when it means *until* (as well as *before*) and chiefly when the leading verb is negative or implies a negative."

It has been charged in certain quarters that Dr. Gildersleeve wastes much valuable time in reducing syntactical principles to formulæ. Whether this charge be well founded or not, it is evident that teachers as well as pupils profit by the great teacher's results. Those who imitate him may change the phraseology, but it does not follow that greater accuracy of statement is thereby gained. Still we must not multiply comparisons which are always more or less odious.

Dr. Goodwin's treatment of the Conditional Sentence is somewhat more satisfactory than in the old edition, but he still fails to make the proper distinction between the Future Indicative with $\varepsilon\acute{\iota}$ and the Subjunctive with $\varepsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. This latter

Dr. Gildersleeve calls the "anticipatory condition," and the former the "expectatory"—the difference between the two being the difference between anticipation and expectation.

Dr. Goodwin says that the Future Indicative with $\epsilon\iota$ is very often used for the Subjunctive in Future Conditions as a still more vivid form of expression, especially in appeals to the feelings and in threats and warnings. The first part of this is vaguely expressed and may mean much or little; the latter part, "threats and warnings," will correspond to Dr. Gildersleeve's "minatory and monitory."

Dr. Goodwin treats the Potential Optative and Indicative more prominently as original constructions, and doubtless bears in mind the warning of Dr. Gildersleeve, that when there is no consciousness of a definite ellipsis it is not well to explain the construction on the ground of an ellipsis. Here again Dr. Gildersleeve's formula is found useful: "The impossibility of definite ellipsis constitutes the Modality."

The chapters on the independent use of $\mu\eta$ and on the Infinitive and Participle show a marked improvement over the former editions, although in his treatment of the Participle our author fails to reveal the same careful study of the *American Journal of Philology*.

The following paragraphs may be cited as admitting of further revision:—

"§905 N. Rarely a singular verb has a masculine or feminine subject in the plural; as $\xi\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \xi\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\omicron\iota\ \xi\varsigma\ \text{'Αβύδου}\ \xi\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \alpha\pi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\iota\omicron\nu$, and there is a distance of seven stades from Abydos to the opposite coast. In such cases the plural form often seems to have arisen from an afterthought, especially when the subject follows the verb."

It is not clear how this example illustrates "an afterthought." We say in English, it is ninety-five miles from Sewanee to Nashville, or in other words (the distance) from Sewanee to Nashville is ninety-five miles. The cases are parallel. And so the phrase $\xi\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \omicron\tilde{\nu}$ may be explained by referring $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$ to a collective noun for an antecedent, and it is to be remarked here that the expression $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tilde{\iota}\nu\ \omicron\tilde{\nu}$ does occur.

"§1024 N. (b). But οἷός τε in Attic Greek means *able, capable*, like δυνατός, being originally elliptical for τοιοῦτος οἷος, *such as*, τέ having no apparent force."

If Dr. Goodwin will restudy carefully sentences which illustrate οἷος and οἷός τε he will doubtless find that the force of τέ is not altogether lost, that οἷος denotes rather the "disposition," and οἷός τε the "position." In other words that οἷος is used more strictly of character, and that οἷός τε implies first adaptation then possibility.

Under the head of Final and Object clauses (§1362) it seems that it would have been advisable to have mentioned the use of ἔως as a final particle in the Odyssey. Attention might also have been called to the frequent use of paratactic μή in pre-Attic Greek and its very rare use in Attic Greek. It is well to quicken the observation even of the more youthful pupils. The fact might have been stated even if the principle had not been discussed.

In §1513 N., Dr. Goodwin speaks of ὥφελον with the Infinitive (negative μή) and further adds that it may even be preceded by εἴθε, εἰ γάρ, or ὥς. We are glad to observe that he omits the following statement made in the former edition: "the use of εἴθε and εἰ γάρ with it is an anomaly; μή should perhaps be constructed with the Infinitive." It would have been better if he had inserted in his new edition that this use of μή as well as that of εἴθε and εἰ γάρ is to be explained on the ground of analogy; that ὥφελον with the Infinitive was used to express a wish; was therefore regarded as a wishing clause, and after the analogy to the more usual construction could be introduced by εἴθε and εἰ γάρ and take the regular negative for wishing clauses, the negative μή. Under no circumstances is the negative to be coupled with the Infinitive. The position of the negative would seem to indicate the contrary.

We are pleased to note that all citations from the Greek authors are referred to the special author of the sentence quoted. A complete index of the sentences quoted would have been found valuable. In Part V., as we are told, the

principal additions are the sections on dactylo-epitritic rhythms with greater detail about other lyric verses and the use of two complete strophes of Pindar to illustrate that poet's two most common metres. The catalogue of verbs shows careful revision and some enlargement, especially in the Homeric forms. Careless errors are most infrequent; as in §39, 3, where (*See* 565, 8,) should read (*See* 565, 6.)

In conclusion we wish to express our sincere thanks for this excellent edition of a most valuable work. We know of no Greek grammar that may be considered its superior for use in schools, and yet we are pained to realize that so eminent a scholar as Dr. Goodwin has shown such a lack of literary conscience as his volume reveals. We regret also that we must call attention to the fact that if Dr. Goodwin had made a careful and appreciative study of Dr. Gildersleeve's edition of *Justin Martyr* (1877) and incorporated the results of his study in the second edition of his *Grammar* (1879) many of the emendations which we have pointed out in the edition under review would have been anticipated to the benefit both of Dr. Goodwin's students and of the scholarly public. Let us "render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's."